

163

03-26-04

3611



#19

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING - EXPRESS MAIL**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks:  
Enclosed herewith are the following documents:  
Application documents for a utility patent entitled:  
**LOADING PLATFORM SYSTEM WITH SLIDE UNIT**  
Inventor Jens Herman Jensen  
Docket No: NI 127  
Case SN 09/590,905

Request for reconsideration of petition to withdraw Notice of Abandonment

I hereby certify that the correspondence identified above is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as: **EXPRESS MAIL**

Mailing Label: ER 063298237 US

in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**RECEIVED**  
APR 01 2004  
**GROUP 3600**

on: 3/25/04

K. Bach

3/25/04

Klaus Bach

date

4407 Twin Oaks Drive

Murrysville, PA 15668



KLAUS J. BACH & ASSOCIATES  
PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
4407 TWIN OAKS DRIVE  
MURRYSVILLE, PA 15668 USA  
TEL: 724-327-0664  
FAX: 724-327-0004

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Case: NI 127  
Serial Nos.: 09/107,948  
Title: LOADING PLATFORM SYSTEM WITH SLIDE UNIT  
Examiner: Steven A. Bratlie.  
Group Art Unit 3611

**RECEIVED**  
APR 01 2004  
**GROUP 3600**

March 25, 2004

Commissioner for Patents  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
c/o Kenneth J. Dorner, Special Programs Examiner

**Request for Reconsideration of the Petition to withdraw Notice of Abandonment**

The petition to the Commissioner to withdraw the Notice of Abandonment dated 10/01/03 received in case SN 09/590,905, which was filed on Nov. 10, 2003, was dismissed with the Notice mailed 03/22/04. Reconsideration of the dismissal is respectfully requested.

The reason for abandonment given: Applicants failure to timely file a proper reply to the Office Action mailed on 03/04/03.

The fact remains however that no such Official action has been received by the undersigned.

Of course Applicant has searched the file jacket and docket records which clearly indicated that the Office Communication was not received.

As to the docket records, this Office uses a system which is more suitable for a small Office like that of the undersigned: In addition to a computer entry for a particular case, immediately upon receipt of an Office action, a letter is prepared and sent to the Applicant advising him of the receipt of the action and giving him the due date. The due date is then entered on the back of the file and the file is placed – in due date order - on a wait shelf in the Office of the undersigned so that the due date is clearly visible. When an Applicant's comments are received, the respective file is removed from the wait shelf and placed on the desk of the undersigned for

preparing the response to the official action. This occurs always with little or no delay after receipt of Applicants comments. All the other cases remain in due date order on the wait shelf.

This system has been found to be extremely efficient and reliable for a small Office as the present.

If an Official action had been received, the file would have been pulled from the general file. An entry would have been made into the prosecution data sheet, the file wrapper would have been marked with the due date, a letter would have been generated to advise the Applicant and solicit his comments and the file would have been placed onto the wait shelf in the Office of the undersigned.

None of this has occurred. The undersigned is 100% sure that no Official action has been received by this Office.

The Examiners Official Action allegedly mailed on 03/04/03 must have been lost in the Patent Office or in the mail or delivered by the mailman to another address (which is not uncommon either) from where it was not forwarded to the undersigned. (Furthermore it is noted that just in the last two weeks I have received from the Patent Office an Official Action with my address on the cover sheet showing through the window but the action inside relating to another case – I have advised the Examiner; she will reissue the action. In another case, where the issue fee had been paid, I received a Notice of Abandonment for not having submitted the formal drawings. The Examiner had originally marked the drawings to be acceptable. In this case, the Notice requesting new drawings had been sent to another firm - according to the Office file records. A new Notice will be sent to me – so I was advised). This is only to show that errors can and do occur also in the Patent Office.

In any case, reconsideration of the dismissal of the request to withdraw the Notice of abandonment is solicited. It is also respectfully requested that a copy of the Examiner's Official action dated 03/04/03 is supplied and a new date for response is set.

Respectfully submitted,

Klaus J. Bach, 26832